PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

The MINISTER'S QUARTERLY

L.
2
ER 1961

sued
the
terest of
he
urish
inistry

THE EDITOR'S PAGE

THE MINISTER AND HIS CRAFT

The Mouthpiece of God 2
—A. Leland Jamison

When Divorced People Marry 7
—Alfred Schmalz

Professional Obsolescence 10
—Robert E. Allard

THE MINISTER AND THE CHURCH

Ministers and Social Ethics 13
—Culbert G. Rutenber

Is Prayer Too Cheap These Days? 22
—Franklin D. Elmer, Jr.

THE MINISTER AND WORSHIP

A Service of Worship in Christian Music 23
—R. M. Bartlet and D. A. Gillies

THE QUARTERLY FORUM

The Dilemma of Our Liberal Evangelism 28
—Kenneth A. Coates

Are We Still Protestants? 30
—John Joseph Stoudt

Letters to the Editor 31

SPECIAL FEATURES

The Church 6

Paul Bids Farewell to Onesimus 35

Fathers and Brethren 36

Application for Enrollment 37

Editorial Board
NATHANAEL M. GUPTILL, Chairman
RICHARD P. CARTER
RAYMOND E. GIBSON
PAUL E. IRION
CHARLES W. SCHWANTES
HAROLD H. WILKE

Editorial Assistant
MARJORIE I. POWELL

VOL. XVII NUMBER 2

SUMMER 1961

THE MINISTER'S QUARTERLY

published quarterly for Congregational Christian and Evangelical and Reformed ministers by
THE COMMISSION ON CHURCH AND MINISTRY OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF
THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST

All communications should be addressed to the office of
THE MINISTER'S QUARTERLY, Room 915, 287 Park Ave. So., New York 10, N. Y.

Single copy 25 cents. Annual Subscription One Dollar.

Second class postage paid at St. Louis, Missouri

Printed by EDEN PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Missouri

HE EDITOR'S PAGE

ı Pleasing Some . . .

The familiar aphorism about "fooling some of the people some of the time" etc., ., could be re-written about pleasing people. Every pastor knows that even if there rare moments when it seems that he is "pleasing all the people all the time" those the moments when he is likely to suspect that he is beginning to "savor of the things men more than of the things of God."

The aim of the MINISTER'S QUARTERLY is not to please all the people all the ıe, but to help parish pastors do their work better. In the pursuit of this stated pur- ;e, however, our mail indicates that we do please some some of the time and displease ıers some of the time. We are glad to receive this mail. Several of the letters express- ; displeasure have resulted in changes in our publication which we believe were provements. The letters expressing pleasure encourage us to go on—just as the occa- nal gratitude of a parishioner, even though it really belongs to God, makes one a ter pastor.

We confess that some mail does puzzle us from time to time. One letter this spring k violent offense at our use of the expression, "Fathers and Brethren," over the umn by that name. We thought for a time of changing it to "Reverend and dear :" but decided some might like that less. Besides, many of our ministers are women! ɔout 200).

This is by way of prelude to pointing out that our QUARTERLY FORUM depart- nt is quite large this time. It happened once before that there were so many vigorous, vocative letters we just had to devote a considerable section of the magazine to print- them. We hope this will be forgiven once in a while.

This Issue

The dilemma of the Church is that it is the indispensable body of the living Christ ile at the same time often finds itself the crucifier of the Christ it was made to serve. is dilemma is the daily cross of the parish pastor who is called to be Christ's minister ile at the same time he must "serve a church." The tensions this causes in the nister's life are dealt with both honestly and kindly in Professor Rutenber's article, *nisters and Social Ethics.*

The matter of enrollment as Ministers of the United Church of Christ is of vital portance to all in our family of faith. For Evangelical and Reformed Ministers it is te well taken care of by actions of the E. and R. Church. For Congregational Chris- ı Ministers it is not quite so simple, since to be listed they must request enrollment. of them have been sent instructions and forms to facilitate this process, but in e any did not receive these we have printed an extra enrollment application inside back cover of this issue. We hope and expect that nearly all C.C. pastors will be olled as Ministers of the United Church of Christ by this fall.

Editorial Board
NATHANAEL M. GUPTILL, Chairman
RICHARD P. CARTER
RAYMOND E. GIBSON
PAUL E. IRION
CHARLES W. SCHWANTES
HAROLD H. WILKE

Editorial Assistant
MARJORIE I. POWELL

VOL. XVII
NUMBER 2

SUMMER 1961

THE MINISTER'S QUARTERLY

published quarterly for Congregational Christian and Evangelical and Reformed ministers by
THE COMMISSION ON CHURCH AND MINISTRY OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF
THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST

All communications should be addressed to the office of
THE MINISTER'S QUARTERLY, Room 915, 287 Park Ave. So., New York 10, N. Y.

Single copy 25 cents. Annual Subscription One Dollar.

Second class postage paid at St. Louis, Missouri

Printed by EDEN PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Missouri

HE EDITOR'S PAGE

ı Pleasing Some . . .

The familiar aphorism about "fooling some of the people some of the time" etc., ., could be re-written about pleasing people. Every pastor knows that even if there rare moments when it seems that he is "pleasing all the people all the time" those the moments when he is likely to suspect that he is beginning to "savor of the things men more than of the things of God."

The aim of the MINISTER'S QUARTERLY is not to please all the people all the ıe, but to help parish pastors do their work better. In the pursuit of this stated pur- e, however, our mail indicates that we do please some some of the time and displease ers some of the time. We are glad to receive this mail. Several of the letters express- displeasure have resulted in changes in our publication which we believe were provements. The letters expressing pleasure encourage us to go on—just as the occa- nal gratitude of a parishioner, even though it really belongs to God, makes one a ter pastor.

We confess that some mail does puzzle us from time to time. One letter this spring k violent offense at our use of the expression, "Fathers and Brethren," over the umn by that name. We thought for a time of changing it to "Reverend and dear :" but decided some might like that less. Besides, many of our ministers are women! out 200).

This is by way of prelude to pointing out that our QUARTERLY FORUM depart- nt is quite large this time. It happened once before that there were so many vigorous, vocative letters we just had to devote a considerable section of the magazine to print- them. We hope this will be forgiven once in a while.

This Issue

The dilemma of the Church is that it is the indispensable body of the living Christ ile at the same time often finds itself the crucifier of the Christ it was made to serve. is dilemma is the daily cross of the parish pastor who is called to be Christ's minister ile at the same time he must "serve a church." The tensions this causes in the nister's life are dealt with both honestly and kindly in Professor Rutenber's article, *nisters and Social Ethics.*

The matter of enrollment as Ministers of the United Church of Christ is of vital portance to all in our family of faith. For Evangelical and Reformed Ministers it is te well taken care of by actions of the E. and R. Church. For Congregational Chris- ı Ministers it is not quite so simple, since to be listed they must request enrollment. of them have been sent instructions and forms to facilitate this process, but in e any did not receive these we have printed an extra enrollment application inside back cover of this issue. We hope and expect that nearly all C.C. pastors will be olled as Ministers of the United Church of Christ by this fall.

THE MOUTHPIECE OF GOD

by A. LELAND JAMISON*

The modern minister is expected to out-Paul the great apostle.

THE MOST CONFUSED profession in 20th century America is the Protestant ministry. In our eagerness to be all things to all men, we ministers too frequenty end up as religious jacks-of-all-trades, masters of none, uncertain of our own identity, borrowing prestige from a great tradition which has become largely irrelevant to the real concerns of modern man. This blurred image is not wholly of our own choosing or making: rather, we respond too readily to the pressures of those to whom we have been called to minister—both the secular community and those who belong, nominally at least, within the household of faith. We feel compelled to wear a succession of masks—priest, scholar, preacher, counselor, fund-raiser and promoter, social case-worker, Boy Scout leader,—and usually we wear none with conviction or full competence. A recent self-critic of the clergy has observed that "not knowing what one thing it ought to do, it has dabbled in many things, blithely hoping all the while that some mystic and invisible cord could somehow pull all these scattered functions into one divine purpose." This is a large hope, indeed. Even St. Paul recognized that the servants of God have "gifts that differ according to the grace given to us." He nowhere intimated that any one person receives all the gifts or is able to concentrate all ministries within himself. Yet the modern minister is expected to out-Paul the great apostle.

It is not my purpose, however, to berate the laity for this diffusion of our ministerial energies and what small talents God has granted us. Rather, on this solemn occasion of ordination and initiation, I prefer to call for a clarification of the proper functions of the Protestant minister, to challenge ourselves who hold the sacred office to become what we ought to be, to do what, I believe, God has called us to do. The Protestant ministry, in these latter days, surely and, perhaps, as all times since the first flush of the Reformation, is confronted by grievous difficulties. Our task, even assuming that we know what it is, is frighteningly difficult. We are confronted by the twin threats of secularism and religiosity, by the spirit that neither knows nor cares about God and by a too facile acceptance of the *forms* of religion without comprehension of its radical demands or of its authentic assurances. Against either threat to the integrity of Christian faith we need to "put on the whole armor of God"; we need to pursue our mission in strength with a sure sense of direction, with the firm resolution to be authentic ministers of God, and not to fritter away this precious opportunity and responsibility on trivial and irrelevant diversions.

This high ideal is easier stated than achieved. The Protestant ministry today suffers its own defects and, in addition, is confronted by various temptations which insidiously sap its integrity. For one, we

* An address delivered at the Ordination of Farley W. Wheelwright, in the North Greenwich, Conn., Congregational Church, March 19, 1961. Prof. Jamison, a Presbyterian minister, is Chmn. of the Dept. of Religion at Syracuse U., Syracuse, N. Y.

tempted to be content with intellec-
l mediocrity. There is the lamentable
l all too prevalent *neglect of learning*
ong the clergy. Let's face it, the parson
very likely *not* to be the intellectual
der of either his congregation or his
mmunity. I make this statement out of
g experience in preaching, listening to
nons, and attending ecclesiastical coun-
. All too seldom does the preacher re-
l a knowledge *in depth* of the Bible,
ristian theology, or the major intellec-
l currents of the age. *Reader's Digest,*
e, or the more popular TV programs
m often to constitute the preacher's
rking library. We preachers justify our
n mental sluggishness with the plea
t we must speak to the people on their
n level. As Reinhold Niebuhr has said,
he ministry is the only profession in
ich you can make a virtue of igno-
ce." Probably we underestimate that
el. In any case, it is our peculiar obli-
ion to *raise* the general level of re-
ous understanding, and we can only do
s if we constantly and seriously steep
own minds and thoughts in the accu-
lated wisdom of Christian history. We
st give ourselves time to study and to
nk. The knowledge of God and his
ys is, to be sure, vastly more than theo-
ical learning, but it is never less than
t, and the Protestant minister neglects
rning at the risk of becoming a noisy
g or a clanging cymbal.

This neglect of learning is related to the
ptation which the modern minister
ls most difficult to resist, the tempta-
n to conformity and efficiency. We of
clergy tend, in David Riesman's al-
st classic characterization, to be "other-
ected" men, with our mental radars
ned toward the popular and safe. We
fearful of being different or rebellious.
conform to the conventional standards
l values of society; seldom do we chal-
ge the compromising morality of the
ular world. The flannel of our suits
y be a shade darker than that of our
thers on Madison Avenue, but it is still
the flannel of conformity. And we measure success by the same yardsticks of efficiency as those used outside the church. Woe to that minister who has not promoted a new building, or at least the redecoration of an existing structure! The "successful" pastor is he who heads a big, rich, over-organized congregation. How seldom do we stop to inquire: Big for what? Organized for what? Are the riches proclaiming "release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind," are they setting at liberty those who are oppressed? Or do they merely reproduce in the sanctuary a style of living to which the parishioners have become accustomed at home?

Finally, on the negative side, the Protestant minister is often beguiled by the lure of priestcraft. We, at least secretly, envy the Roman priest, his unquestioned and enforceable authority, the objectivity with which he dispenses supernatural benefits through the sacraments. The Roman priest knows perfectly well what he is doing; he does it with assurance. How insecure is the Protestant minister by contrast, how intangible the service which he renders! And so we turn our collars around, "enrich" our liturgy, convert the Lord's Table to an altar, substitute amateurish psychoanalysis for the confessional and otherwise play at being priest. And we *are* priests—but so are *all* who have faith. We need to remind ourselves, again and again, of the priesthood of all believers, to accept humbly the fact that the Protestant minister is only *primus inter pares* (first among equals), a leader and a representative, but not an indispensable mediator between God and man. In the New Testament and Protestant view we have *one* mediator and one only—even Jesus Christ. As for ourselves, we ought to become what the Pope claims to be: *Servus servorum dei* (the slave of God's slaves).

WHERE, THEN, MAY WE find the proper image of our ministry? How shall we identify the unique service which we are called

to perform? Perhaps a recollection of Biblical religion will instruct us. The distinctive faith of Israel had its historical beginnings with neither a priest nor a promoter, but with a prophet. Over the centuries the Lord raised up other prophets to proclaim his will and offer guidance to the people. Christianity itself began in a prophetic revival— the Baptist thundering forth judgment and promise beside the Jordan; Jesus announcing that "the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." I am not at all certain that *many* Palestinians prior to the Crucifixion recognized Jesus as either Messiah or divine Son of God; but the gospels plainly tell us that the people knew him as a prophet and teacher who spoke with the authority of divine understanding. A Jewish scholar recently wrote that even Paul represented a return to older Hebrew prophecy, in that he called men away from the mechanical and external in religion to the spiritual and internal— from the manipulations of ritual to the trust and obedience of faith. Although the Church all too soon fell into the hands of the "organization men," over and over again it has been the prophetic voice which has roused and purified Christianity—Augustine and St. Francis, Wycliff, Hus, Savonarola; Luther and Calvin; Wesley and Jonathan Edwards; Channing, Rauschenbusch, Barth, and Niebuhr—a goodly fellowship which in every generation prepares the way of the Lord. I have no illusions that all or even a few Protestant ministers have the endowments of an Isaiah or a Luther. Neither do I claim that the Church can live by its prophets alone. Continuity as well as creativity is required in any religious community. But when the spirit of prophecy is absent, the Church decays and dies.

Our proper model, then, is Moses, not Aaron; Jeremiah, not the nameless priests who offered semi-magical sacrifices in a doomed Temple. And to Jeremiah came the fateful summons, a summons which he would have preferred to ignore!

"Then the Lord put forth his hand a
touched my mouth; and the Lord sa
to me,

'Behold, I have put my words in yo
mouth.
See, I have set you this day over natio
and over kingdoms,
to pluck up and to break down,
to destroy and to over-throw,
to build and to plant . . .
If you utter what is precious, and n
what is worthless,
You shall be as my mouth.' "
or, as The American Translation re
ders it, "You shall be my mout
piece.' "

What a frightening assignment, to b
come the mouthpiece of the living Go
To have his truth as a burning fire in t
heart, shut up in our bones, so that
cannot hold it in. And yet that is t
primary qualification of the Protesta
minister. Sacraments are good, but
can't honestly believe that they can on
or automatically bring spiritual gra
when administered by a so-called "o
dained" minister. Prayers are essenti
but any man can pray in faith; counseli
is often helpful, but we do not pretend
offer absolution, only God in his mer
can do that. We are indeed, guardians
the decency and order, the peace and p
rity of the church; but the worshiping co
munity can, if necessary, govern itself a
go on worshiping without us. And
have a right to take the office of minis
at all only if we are willing to becom
the mouthpieces of God, only as we a
prepared to endure the discipline of stu
and prayer, of rigorous thinking and
sparing involvement in the agonies of o
time, whereby the living Word of G
may break through *to* us and *through*
to the world. It is not an office for t
indolent, the indifferent, the unloving,
the coward. We are summoned not to
man-pleasing Masters of Ceremonies, b
forthright spokesmen in behalf of etern
justice and everlasting mercy.

The essential requirement, then, of t

phetic minister—and genuine Protestism has room for no other kind—is t he must be responsive to the inaking Word of God. We cannot force Word, but we must not block it. The stery of its coming may be always be d our explanation, but we await it h disciplined expectancy. And, when omes, we receive first the awful reasibility of plucking up and breaking n, of destroying and overthrowing. e true prophet must be an iconoclast, uncompromising critic of the injustices brutalities, the idolatries and hypocs which, by some inexorable law of human condition, rise ever and again make us rebels against God and enes of each other. The Biblical record quite clear on this point: the great phets were the great protesters—proors against the evils of economic extation, against heartless extravagance dehumanizing immorality, against the lness of nationalistic pride and the version of noble religion. The status was for them never above reproach, they measured every human achieveit by the standard of the holy God. y, too, were tempted often to cry ace" when there was no peace, but steeled themselves to speak the cauzing truth. Even today their words do make easy reading. But today, as well ong ago, the prophetic judgment on a ld gone wrong must be pronounced. It ie peculiar commission of the prophetic ister to read the signs of the times, lid Amos and Jeremiah, and, at what- cost in popularity or personal security, peak the word of judgment against all exalt the creature above the Creator.

T THE PROPHET WAS never and must now be merely a predicter of doom. cisely because he understands that the l issues of history and the ultimate iny of men rest with God, he is able ee beyond the apparent hopelessness ny present moment. The prophet is a comforter, a herald of good news to those who trust in God. He knows that the final intention of the divine purpose is reconciliation and peace. He passionately believes that no impediment can finally separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord; he confidently looks forward to the full establishment of that kingdom which is love and joy and peace. Thus the prophet can be and must be an architect of the future, preparing the way of the Lord, making straight in the desert a highway for our God. It was such a prophetic vision of a better world to come that sustained Israel through centuries of oppression; it has been the greater vision of the Kingdom of God which has fired the imagination of Christian reformers and reconcilers. It is our ministerial duty to translate these visions into the practical realities of Main Street and Pennsylvania Avenue—into the policies and institutions of the common life. This is the last, best hope of earth. To accomplish such translation requires all the devotion, the intelligence, and the courage we can muster. But if we are true mouthpieces we shall not shrink from the commission which God lays upon us:

"For tho' this world with devils filled
Should threaten to undo us,
We shall not fear, for God hath willed
His truth to triumph Through us."

Each one of us, at some points along the road between birth and death, is forced to make certain momentous decisions; not many, to be sure, yet no one can avoid at least a few. One such is the decision of marriage; another the decision of faith or unfaith; a third of surpassing importance, surely, is the choice of vocation. The last is one of peculiar difficulty for him who is called to the sacred office of the ministry. Who, indeed, is sufficient for so demanding an assignment? How can a man be so presumptious as to offer himself as a mouthpiece of God? Of course, if we view the ministerial function after the manner of Simon of Samaria, who offered Peter money and requested: "Give me also this

power, that anyone on whom I lay my hands may receive the Holy Spirit," the choice may not be especially agonizing. It is possible to regard the ministry as a kind of ecclesiastical civil-service, in which one secures tenure by virtue of examinations passed and routine duties efficiently performed. But the Biblical and Protestant ideal is much less mechanical, much more dynamic than this. The prototypes of our "calls" should be Moses at the Bush, Amos grasped by God as he tended his flocks, Isaiah overcome by burning ecstasy in the Temple, Jesus hearing a heavenly voice by the fords of the Jordan, Paul struck blind on the Damascus Road. Few of us experience such a dramatic summons. Nevertheless, although the spectacular intensity of the classical prophetic confrontation may not come to us, we ought to cultivate within ourselves, as God enables us, the gifts of prophecy. W ought to pray constantly for the visio which is able to penetrate idolatrous pr tension and complacent mediocrity; v ought to study the human situation an bring to bear upon it all the resources accumulated revelation, all the purgin power of a conscience sensitive to the pe fect righteousness of God, all the creativ hopefulness of that faith which affirm that the kingdoms of this world *will* b come the Kingdom of our God and h Messiah. We cannot perform miracles— we cannot coerce God or dominate h people. The Christian adventure as Rein hold Niebuhr has observed is "a mutu search for truth in which the preacher a leader among many searchers." B leader he must and can be. To this hig privilege we invite you now.

THE CHURCH

by Howard O. Stearns, Jr.*

Upon the hallowed ground cast over with the emerald flush of early spring, its fo
worn steps and hand darkened doors telling with silent witness of those who wit
thoughtless regularity have entered in,
Stands the church.

When from my window across the street I take in with rapid glance its sweeping gable
the tapered tower, the jutting ells and gaudy windows stained in glass.
I recall that this fire replacement, the sixth upon the site, now made outdated by moder
trends of pre-stressed trusses and school rooms sheathed in glass,
Is still for most the one, the only Church.

And so I yearn that fire again may strike, not upon this still sufficient structure,
But with Pentecostal violence upon the hearts of those whose hands and feet ha
scarred the portal doors.
That when again they enter in they may know in penitential surety the One who
blessed hands and feet were scarred for us,
And share with joy unbridled by human pride the truth that no sticks or stones pu
end to end
Can ever be the Church.

---

* Pastor, First Church, Danvers, Mass.

WHEN DIVORCED PEOPLE MARRY:
Counselling With the Children

by ALFRED SCHMALZ*

There's a sadness about such an interview, for here is a hurt to be healed and a separation to be endured . . .

MARRIAGE OF PERSONS DIVORCED from their ouses will often unite two sets of chil- en, as well as two adults. These chil- en should figure as importantly in the inister's pre-marital counselling as do e parents.

Counselling with the adults will of urse precede any discussion with the ildren of their new relationships within e forthcoming marriage. Since the par- ts are the most important factor in ally resolving any anxieties which the ildren may have, and in adjusting them this new environment, it is essential at they understand that the children ay have problems, and that they be ncerned that these problems be brought to the open and discussed. As they ex- nine their own attitudes and feelings out this marriage, and about the rela- onships being entered into by themselves d their children, they will probably ve no hesitancy, indeed are likely to re- ond eagerly to the opportunity of having e children given help, should they need

When any two persons marry who have en divorced, the minister has a wide nge of matters to cover in the counsel- ng interview. But, where children are volved, a whole further set of issues ust be discussed.

If the former spouse (let him for our rpose be a father) has visiting privi- ges, how will the children's new father act to his appearance at the door to pick the children, for an outing, or for a hole week-end with him? What if his gal right to visit the children interrupts me plans that the new father had de- veloped for this particular time? When the children, having been with their own father, return with excitement and enthusiasm to tell about what fun they have had, will this be an annoyance to the new father, difficult to accept and listen to?

Or again, referring now to both adults in this new marriage, are they forewarned that they may experience jealousy for their own children? Will they be able to feel equal affection for, and deal with equal fairness with, the children from both sides? Should the children's interests collide, and some resolution of conflict be arbitrarily necessary, who shall speak the authoritative and disciplining world? And how will the other feel about this?

These and other questions are raised by the counsellor to indicate the natural problems in emotional response and feeling in this situation, and to give both adults a chance to explore their feelings with the minister.

When the interview with the adults reaches a conclusion, the minister may then suggest that the children have matters to think about and to discuss also, and that it could be to their advantage to air these problems and to work toward a solution of them.

The children should come all together, and without the presence of parents. The first task of the counsellor will be to make these children feel comfortable in his presence, after which he will explain to them why he has invited them to come. It can be done casually: "When a minister marries two people, he always asks them to come to see him to talk about their marriage. Your parents have been in to see me, as you know. You children

* Pastor, First Church, Darien, Conn.

may want to talk about the marriage too."

How the minister proceeds from this point will depend upon his general practice in counselling, his actual knowledge of these children, the rapport he has established with them, and on his intuitive ability to listen for over-tones of meaning in their questions and responses. If during the interview he senses a deeper emotional problem that can be met by just this brief interview, he may wish to see one or all of the children again. If, however, no serious problem emerges, he may do no more than cover the areas of possible anxiety, to see if the children have feelings to deal with, and then let the matter rest. The parents themselves will quite likely be able to deal satisfactorily with their family and home situation from this point on.

COUNSELLING WITH THE CHILDREN may begin with the minister asking them how well they know each other, and listening to their accounts of visiting back and forth, of doing things together, of fun, maybe of difficulty. It could be that the children of these two households are already fairly well acquainted, and have an easy relationship. This will not preclude the necessity of talking over the problems which may result from the closer inside-the-family situation that they have not yet actually experienced. If the children do not know each other at all, or have visited one another very little, the counsellor has of course the necessity of getting them into a friendly atmosphere of easy talking before he can move into the matter of their possible problems.

Areas of conversation with the children will normally be three: one, the continuing relationship with their own parent, now living apart from them; two, the relationship with the new parent; and three, their relationship to one another as brothers and sisters.

Assume, for our purpose, that their own parent is the father, and that now they must both continue a relationship to him and build a new relationship to a second father. The child of course does not see this in our adult terms, but may well be aware of anxiety about what each man should mean to him now. Can he still love his own father, if his mother doesn't love him any more? Will his own father continue to love him, perhaps dropping him as the mother was dropped? Can he talk about his own father, to his mother, to his new father; or must he not talk about him? When he sees his own father, should he be pleasant to him, or should he act aloof as his mother does? Can he write his own father? Will his own father remember his birthday? These are the questions which may be shaping his feelings.

Plainly the counsellor must know something about the earlier relationship of the father to this child, and how the child's mother feels about her former husband, if he is to act constructively. Let's say, for our purpose, that the relationship between child and father is good, and that the mother is not expressing dislike or bitterness toward her former husband. In this case the child may have no anxious inner feelings. The counsellor, however, does not take this for granted. He talks about the child's father: asks whether they see each other, what they do together, how they get along. Knowing that love exists, he assures the child that there always will be love. He encourages the child to write his father, to see him as often as possible, to talk about what they do together. All this is important re-assurance. But what if the child and the father had been in conflict, or the father had given no love? This puts a quite different face on the conversation. The child may have to be encouraged to air his feelings of rejection, and to be given the assurance that in this new relationship he will surely find love.

From talking about one's own father to talking about the new father is an easy progression. "How do you two get along together?" the minister may begin." Do you have fun?" There would ordinarily

be little reason for the child to question the intention of the new father to be good to him and to love him, But the minister enlarges upon the fact that this man has not been the child's father before, and that this boy has not been this man's son before, and that they are both of them just beginning to be father and son. "You'll each try hard, I know," the minister adds. "But you'll make some mistakes, both of you. And don't feel too badly about it. This is something new for you both."

The minister may remark that the new father will be different in many ways from his own father. "Your new father can't be just like your own father. He will do things differently, and you'll have to get used to this. But he means to love you and to do what is good for you."

Discipline and authority need discussing too. "Your new father really has to be a father, you know, and that means that he'll have to say 'no' sometimes, and that you can't just do anything you want. He's not a guest in your house. Not a brother. He's a father. And that means he has to be obeyed."

The question of what name to call the new father is often puzzling to a child. He may not want to call the new parent "Daddy," a term reserved perhaps for his own father. What then? If the child doesn't know what to call the new father, or hasn't been asked by the new father to call him by some particular name, the minister may suggest to the boy that he and the new father talk it over.

Finally the minister will talk about the new relationship which the children will have to each other. "You didn't decide to be brothers and sisters, did you?" he may begin. "But now you are!" He tries to help them see that they have to get to know each other, just as they do with any boys and girls. "But you can grow to be good friends," he tells them. "What do we call each other?" they may ask. "You're half-brother and half-sister," he replies; "but speak of yourselves as brother and sister. It's what you really want to be." Conversation may lead into a discussion of possible jealousy, of one or the other feeling he is not treated equally or fairly. "Everybody feels that way sometimes," the minister may say.

THE COUNSELLOR HAS TO BE intuitive in this kind of interview, as in interviews with adults, listening with the third ear for possible emotional over-tones suggesting particular areas of anxiety or concern. If he discovers a situation which needs professional help beyond what he himself can provide, he of course makes the suggestion to the parents that some further help be sought. Ordinarily the parents, if made aware of a possible problem in family relationships, will be able to work toward its solution themselves.

At this point, unless other issues have arisen, the interview may come to an end. "Anything else you'd like to talk about?" the minister asks. If the children look satisfied, he says goodbye, and reminds them that he will see them at the wedding.

There's a sadness about such an interview, for here is a hurt to be healed and a separation to be endured, even if this is not overtly felt and expressed. The counsellor cannot return the children to their previous home situation. But he can hope to lift from them a burden of anxiety which they need not carry, by relieving them of unnecessary fears. Every effort should be made to give them a happy entrance into their new family and into their new home.

PROFESSIONAL OBSOLESCENCE— The Enemy Within the Gates

by Robert E. Allard*

Until every minister of the United Church of Christ is annually engaged in not less than 100 hours of formal continuing education the enemy of professional obsolescence is still within the gates . .

Profession (Pro: *before, prior; fateri:* avow, declare) evolved its original meaning within a religious context. It was used to characterize those who were admitted to practice special functions in religious orders.

With the rise of universities, this meaning was enlarged and the *learned* professions emerged: theology, law, and medicine. It was members of these three professions who were largely responsible for shaping the communities and formulating the basic values of early America.

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, law and medicine, as professions, have consistently improved the professional competency of their practitioners. Requirements for admission to professional study have grown increasingly difficult; qualifications for licensure have been systematically intensified; advanced professional standing has become more and more dependent upon continuing professional education. Protestant theology, on the other hand, has spent a century and a half struggling to regain the position it lost when the Great Revivals inundated American churches with anti-intellectual pietism. Today, its ministers have almost succeeded in acquiring professional skills sufficient to cope with some of the crises of the nineteenth century although the industrial revolution, Darwinianism, Marxism, Freudianism, and urbanism are still too much for too many ministers. There are notable exceptions. They are too few—and new cultural crises continue to arise.

Social change is and gives every indication of continuing to be a fact: "No one will live all his life in the world into which he was born, and no one will die in the world in which he worked in his maturity. . . . Often, only a few months may elapse before something which previously was easily taken for granted must be unlearned or transformed to fit the new state of knowledge or practice."[1] This current Heracleitian view of the nature of our professional-intellectual universe is long overdue in all of the learned professions—but especially in theology.

As early as 1937, medicine was officially recognizing that its practitioners would begin to become obsolete five years after graduation unless postgraduate education were provided.[2] In 1953, the profession was dissatisfied when only one out of every four practitioners received an average of 36 hours of formal training in addition to individual reading, hospital and medical society meetings, etc., while working an average of 60 hours per week.[3] From their point of view, an annual minium of 50 hours for formal training supplemented by reading, meetings, etc., for every practitioner would be only a modest beginning toward some adequate program of continuing professional education.

The most recent and adequate empirical study, *The Continuing Education of the American Minister,* does not even raise the issue as to whether a definite number of hours of formal training is needed for minimum competency in the ministry.[4] Mr. Gamble's study, however, is a significant step forward for all who are concerned about the professional competency of the ministry. It deserves careful read-

* When this article was written the author was executive officer of the Home Study Department of the U. of Chicago.

ng and serious analysis by every person vho is thoughtfully concerned about the rofession. His survey reveals far more xisting programs of continuing theologi- al education than many uninformed ritics would have assumed. At the same ime, this study discloses all too clearly he disjointed, spasmodic, mostly un- maginative, and hopelessly inadequate wareness of this problem by ministers, hurches, seminaries, and denominational fficials in most of Protestantism. It also emonstrates an absence of available idea- ional resources for undergirding some inimum of rigorous programs in this ritical area.

On a comparative basis, Mr. Gamble's tudy shows that the United Church is etter than many but not so good as some ther denominations in its recognition of he problem of professional obsolescence nd in its development of programs being volved to meet and defeat this enemy ithin our gates. The most sympathetic valuation of this awareness and the re- ulting efforts, however, does not modify he foregoing conclusions. On the whole, inisters, churches, seminaries, and offi- ials of the United Church exhibit little wareness of the problem and even fewer deational resources for effectively coping ith this enemy within our gates.

This conclusion, however, does not ounsel the comfortable couch of hopeless esignation. On the contrary, the above is et forth as the basis for a manifesto of ction in the concrete. This manifesto resumes both the reality of the profes- ional obsolescence of many of our min- sters as well as the functional probability f a very slow growth of denominational wareness that this problem exists and hat something can be done about it. This anifesto does not require that the total esources of all of our churches be im- ediately mobilized to do battle with this nemy. It requires only the existence of a aving remnant: one association, one con- erence, one seminary, and one denomi- ational committee. If any of these exist, here is hope for tomorrow.

The following are set forth not as complete or final answers but as serious proposals of solutions which could be implemented within two years, using only existing budgets, and with no gross increase of staff personnel:

I. Association

1. A rigorous "apprentice" program of not less than five years of continuing professional education for every newly ordained minister serving in any of its member churches;

2. Not less than three months of paid educational sabbatical leave each year for one out of every ten to twelve ministers in the association.

3. Every minister in the association enrolled in not less than one academic course annually.

II. Conference or Synod

1. A three to five year program of serious consultation by a competent standing committee composed of ministers and laymen with experts in continuing professional education drawn from seminaries, universities, and the professions;

2. Not less than one year of paid educational sabbatical leave each year for one out of every twenty or thirty ministers in the synod or conference;

3. An annual study program of depth for the ministers and lay officers of every church in the synod or conference.

III. Seminary

1. A serious research program to determine how much of what kind of continuing education is necessary for maintaining a minimum professional competency;

2. The development of study-guides and examinations for annual synodical or conference study programs;

3. A post-professional degree program designed so that ministers could continue to serve local churches and still satisfy legitimate requirements for such degrees within three to five years.

IV. Denominational Committee

1. A rigorous and exhaustive survey of comparative obsolescence among the professions;

2. A critical comparison of the professional competency of minitsers engaged in systematic continuing professional education as contrasted with the competency of ministers not so engaged in regular study;

3. A serious and continuing consultation with experts in the fields of professional education and adult education about various aspects of the problem.

THERE CAN BE NO avoiding these proposals by relying on the rationalization that such programs would cost too much money. These programs or their equivalents could be implemented within two years without increasing current budgets or personnel. To accomplish these highly desirable goals might very well involve discontinuing or modifying existing programs; it might entail the elimination of some extravagant economies; it might necessitate the shift of some personnel functions. These are procedural problems to be solved. They do not constitute insurmountable barriers. It could be done if anyone were determined that it was going to be done.

Three questions appear to remain:

1. Is professional obsolescence really an "enemy within the gates," i. e., a significant obstacle to our witness to the Gospel in our generation?
2. If it is, can any effective programs be realistically devised to correct it?
3. If so, are there persons who are willing to do something about it?

Since there are no objective criteria or research results to provide a conclusive answer to the first issue, it seems apparent that reasonable men might disagree about the existence or the effects of professional obsolescence. Proponents of the *status quo* should have little difficulty in finding grounds to deny its existence and to minimize its effects. There are, however, many ministers and laymen who affirm its existence and deplore its effects.

The suggested programs are indicative of possible corrective devices. Implementation of such programs might well meet some resistance on the part of some ministers. It is conceivable that less stringent demands might be more palatable initiations into systematic and continuing professional education. However, until every minister from top to bottom in the United Church is annually engaging in the equivalent of not less than 100 hours of systematic, formal, and continuing theological education, the enemy of professional obsolescence is still within the gates—all apologies and counter-arguments notwithstanding.

Finally, are there persons willing to do something about it? The answer to this question awaits empirical testing. If one determined minister or layman is convinced that the problem exists and something can be done about it, that is a sufficient beginning. Hopefully, there is one association, one synod or conference, one seminary, one committee or board in this denomination which is composed of enough thoughtful, sensitive, wise, and courageous persons to take up one visible and dramatic attack against this debilitating enemy. Once the attack is launched, victory may come hard but our heritage and our faith should make it certain.

If we fail to face and defeat this enemy, the alternative is not a learned profession increasingly characterized by obsolescence —the alternative is an obsolete profession.

---

[1] Mead, Margaret, "A Redefinition of Education," *Journal of the National Education Association*, 48: 15-17, October, 1959.

[2] Buerki, R. C., *Report of the Commission on Graduate Medical Education*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1940.

[3] Vollan, D. D., *Postgraduate Medical Education in the United States*, Chicago, The American Medical Association, 1955.

[4] Gamble, C. C., *The Continuing Theological Education of the American Minister*, Richmond, Virginia, Union Theological Seminary, 1960.

MINISTERS AND SOCIAL ETHICS: A CASE STUDY

by CULBERT G. RUTENBER*

The notion that Christian love means that Christians must never be disturbers of the peace . . . is surely one of the . . . most ironical perversions of New Testament truth.

FROM TIME TO TIME the ministers of the Gospel are impaled on the pointed end of some expert's stick and placed under the magnifying glass. Ray Abrams did it in *Preachers Present Arms,* showing the distressing role of the clergy in whipping up war fever in World War One. Liston Pope did it in *Mill Hands and Preachers,* studying the role of the clergy in a famous strike situation in a mill town in North Carolina. Now Campbell and Pettigrew have done it in *Christians in Racial Crisis,* an analysis of the behavior and attitudes of the clergy when the crisis broke in Little Rock. What is valuable about all these studies is that they hold up the mirror to all of us in positions of Christian leadership and give us the opportunity of a fresh look at ourselves. The mirror is never to be taken as the whole truth. Authors who do sociological studies of this type are inevitably selective in their data and limited in their judgment. Yet, in so far as such studies spur us to more self-analysis and deeper self-understanding, they serve as the unpaid watchmen of our souls. To see our brethren in the ministry struggling with the fateful decisions which events force upon them is to recognize that we are men of like passions as they, and that we and they alike are fit objects of God's judgment and suppliants for his mercy.

In Little Rock there were active segregationists among the clergy who, apparently in perfectly good conscience, opposed any tampering with the status quo, identifying with assured dogmatism segregation and the will of God. In Little Rock there were also active desegregationists who, with great courage, called the status quo to the bar of God's judgment and found it wanting. But in Little Rock there was a third group, and in this group most of the ministers of the established denominations fell. This was the group that believed in desegregation but lapsed into silence as the crisis overwhelmed the city. Why? It is the answer to this question which particularly interests the social scientists from Harvard who made this study. It is the answer to this question which is particularly illuminating to us.

The authors trace the problem of the silent ministers in terms of role-conflict to three reference systems: the professional (their fellow ministers, both local and national), the membership, and their own self-reference system. On the professional level, their denominational superiors were all for social criticism as long as finances did not suffer, membership rolls were not reduced, and attendance did not fall off. No gestures towards social liberalism were worth a dip in finances or attendance.

* Professor of Social Ethics, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Mass. Reprinted here by permission of the *Andover Newton Quarterly.*

On the membership level, the attitude was, of course, predictable. The congregations were overwhelmingly segregationist in sentiment and were opposed to contrary statements or activity on the part of their pastors.

On the level of the self-reference system, three considerations dominated the image the minister had of his own ministry: his role as the cement which held the discordant elements of his church together in one whole; his role as the evangelist who brought in members and kept them coming; his role as the administrator whose task "is to encourage maximum annual giving and to plan for the improvement and expansion of the physical plant" (p. 92).

The minister found himself in a most difficult situation. On the one hand he was an employee of a congregation which paid him to perform certain functions. On the other, as a moral and spiritual leader, he had to deal in criticism, since no man or system is perfect. At the same time, his own future depended on how he handled the resultant tension since, unlike the executive of a large corporation who depends for career advancement on his superiors, the minister of the Gospel "rises or falls with the response of the local congregation and community" (p. 118).

In this situation, the pressure of the congregation *against* the pastor doing anything became determinative. Unaccustomed to rejection for taking a stand on a morally relevant issue, unused to personal abuse for attacking evil, the minister lapsed into silence. His psychological need of the suport of his communicants was so great that he could not move without it. The comments of Campbell and Pettigrew on why this was so are most revealing. After dismissing as a satisfactory explanation a mere concern for personal success, the authors proceed as follows:

> . . . The answer seems to lie more clearly in the accumulated weight of years of training and experience in what may be termed the central ethos of the ministerial profession. The eyes of the minister are trained to turn constantly outward toward people, toward numbers. He must reach people, guide them, win them. Their response becomes a measure of his personal worth. When the plates and the pews are full, and the bricks for the new wing are stacked outside, the evidence of a job well done is all too tangible. When old members greet him warmly and newcomers respond to his invitation to join his flock, he has a sense of well-being. It is not necessary to posit a worldly success motif nor a calculating, self-seeking design, to understand this response. It can be viewed as a logical outgrowth of the types of professional criteria he has accepted as a part of himself. His training teaches him to rest the case for his personal competence on the responses people make to his ministry. He becomes, in this sense, the embodiment of David Rieseman's other-directed person. It follows, then, that any persistent defection in the ranks—whether it takes the minor form of tension and surliness, the more threatening form of absenteeism and tight wallets, or the most serious form of an organized resistance movement that aims to oust the minister—is a shattering personal experience. Not necessarily, we repeat, because he sees his personal life-goals becoming more elusive; rather, because according to the institutional norms that he has long accepted, he is incompetent, a failure. Why? Because the message he delivers is no longer attractive to people. Thus he is no longer attractive to people.[1]

Towards the end of their study, Campbell and Pettigrew seek to identify the variables which seemed to affect the nature and extent of the minister's response

o racial crisis. The data suggested the ollowing hypothesis: (1) Support of de-egregation decreases as racial crisis in-reases; (2) The more popular the de-nomination in the local area, the less ikely are its ministers to defend unpop-ılar causes; (3) The longer the minister ıas been in his church, the less likely ıe is to support desegregation during a risis; (4) The minister is less likely to upport desegregation during a crisis if he s over fifty than if he is under forty; (5) The minister's support of desegregation is ess if his church is in a membership lrive, or building campaign, or fund-aising campaign; (6) The less person-ılly affected are the members of the con-gregation, the greater is the freedom of he minister to support unpopular causes; (7) The more successful (numerically ınd financially) a ministry is, the less ikely the minister will be to give strong upport to unpopular moral imperatives luring a crisis; (8) The more stable the nembership of his church, the less likely will the minister be to support unpopular causes during a crisis.

This telescoped summary of a signif-cant book is all too brief, yet even so it surely suggests a disturbing picture—not of Little Rock as such but of the Ameri-can church, for Little Rock is merely symptomatic of a nationwide disease. The prophetic temper of the Bible is often absent from the modern pulpit. Religion as a cultural buttress reigns supreme. The reasons for this, in so far as we can judge from this study of Little Rock, are both theological and spiritual.

Theologically, one detects here a dis-orted view of the Church. The Church s seen as an institution in society whose existence and unity must be maintained at all costs. Indeed, the only absolute n the Little Rock situation appeared to be: Don't disturb the life of the Church! This appears as both the guiding prin-iple of the local clergy and of their uperiors. For the latter, a successful ninistry warranting advancement is symbolized by a growing congregation and an increased budget. If members leave the church, congregational attend-ence falls off and finances go down, and the minister is a failure whatever else happens during his tenure. At the same time, this study makes clear that a sim-ilar concern for the unity of the church paralyzed the good intentions of the local minister and became the overrid-ing consideration in the situation (p. 93).

WHAT IS OPERATING here is a serious confusion between the Church as the fel-lowship of believers and the Church as an institution in society. They are re-lated but not by any means identical. Brunner may overstate the case when he says that the idea of the *ecclesia* has nothing whatever to do with the idea of an institution, but his emphasis is surely well-placed. The *ecclesia* is a fellowship whose unity is given in the Holy Spirit. It can no more be maintained by human manipulation and compromise with the truth than the Ark of the Covenant could be protected by the worldly efforts of a Uzzah. Yet the *ecclesia* cannot remain merely as a fellowship. It must organize in order to propagate its truth. It is at this point that a deadly danger emerges. The organizational structure develops a life of its own and smothers and obscures the truth it was fashioned to serve. The organization tends to become an end in itself. This is the fate of every high idea in history which gathers around it an organization to preserve and propagate it. The institution devours the parent idea. Yet the idea cannot live without embodiment in an institutional structure. This is the pathos of our human situa-tion. This is the pathos of the Church throughout its history. The life is lost in the clanking of the machinery. And the world takes note of the death of the idea at the very moment that the professional technicians are intensifying their concern for the proper care and maintenance of the purposeless machine.

A footnote from rather recent history will illustrate the danger in which the organized Church always stands. When the Nazis took over France through the Vichy government, they launched the same program of extermination for the Jews that they carried through in Germany. As the lines tightened around the Jews, the leaders of the Reformed Church of France were forced to face the issue of whether or not they should speak out. They did not speak out! Ten years after the end of the war—ten years after the unbelievable depravity of the Nazi regime, with its gas chambers and furnaces for human destruction, had been completely documented and exposed in all depth of horror—one of the leaders of the Reformed Church said to another who had also been present when the decision for silence had been voted, "Nevertheless, we did the right thing. Any other decision would have split the church." A commentator is lost for words. Not even the fears and passions of the existential moment of decision can be invoked in extenuation. In the full illumination of hindsight, nothing makes any difference—not the anguish of the victims, not the glory of God, not the truth of the Gospel—but the survival, intact, of the organization.

Such tender, loving care for the institutional structures of the people of God is foreign to Biblical thought. The Old Testament story is the story of a God who did not hesitate to destroy the institutions of Israel when they no longer served as instruments of his purpose. A faithful remnant was better than a mob of listless time-servers. Such is the lesson of book after book of the Old Testament. The preaching of the prophets is precisely a divinely inspired assault on the unity and stability of organized religion. In the New Testament this assault became a permanent break with the old structures as God made a new beginning. But the new people of God are not exempt from the divine judgment through the dissolution of *their* cherished institutions. "Repent," says the Risen Lord to the church of Ephesus, "else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place" (Rev. 2: 5).

The point, then, is not whether the Church exhibits unity but whether it is performing its function as a church of Jesus Christ. And what is decisive here is an understanding of the nature and mission of the Church. The Church is an eschatological community of faith, hope, and love in which the powers of the age to come have already become manifest. It is the delivered community (though its complete deliverance is yet future) by virtue of God's saving deed in Christ through whom the powers of sin and death have been broken, and release into the liberty of the sons of God has been affected. It exists for the glory of the God who summoned it to his praise and service. In its inner life of worship and nurture it manifests the melting power of the love of Christ to overcome sinful barriers to genuine community. In its witness to the world it points to the delivering Saviour and serves as his surrogate in identifying with men in their bondage and need. It thus becomes, by his grace, a delivering community which breaks the bonds of iniquity and speaks the word of healing and release. The necessity for such service is why, over and over again, God points his people away from absorption in religious practices and rituals to the needs of men. Thus in Isaiah 58, when the people complain that they fast and pray but God pays no attention, God responds through the prophet:

> Is it such a fast that I have chosen? a day for a man to afflict his soul? is it to bow down his head as a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? wilt thou call this a fast, and an acceptable day to the Lord?
>
> Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness,

to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?

Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily, and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy rereward.

Paul wrote the Corinthian church, "Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price." The Church does not belong to itself but lives for him who is the Great Emancipator, who wills emancipation for all. Thus to proclaim God's Good News is not merely to repeat the fact of Christ's death and resurrection "back there," but to relate his emancipating victory back there to the specific bondages that enslave men in the here and now. To preach the Gospel in faithful fact is to stand before men and proclaim deliverance—deliverance from their own sin *and from the sin of others who rob them of the abundant life Christ came to bring.* No bondage can stand unchallenged in the presence of Christ. Christ's own interpretation of his mission —to speak good news to the poor, to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, to bring sight to the blind (Luke 4: 18)—must not be spiritualized into innocuousness.

IT IS CLEAR THAT the church that takes upon itself the burden of proclaiming the Gospel of divine deliverance has committed itself to a ceaseless grappling with the forces of evil in the world and with the structures of injustice in society. It has further committed itself to actualizing within its own fellowship the marks of a delivered community, a community where at least partial release from the prejudices and value-perversions of culture has been effected.

If the Church, in the intention of God, is a delivered and delivering community, then the question of the degree to which it functions as such will not down in any local situation where the urge to absolutize its institutional unity arises. United for what purpose? And unless there is a clear answer to this in the light of God's will for his Church, the insistence on institutional unity can itself be a way of betraying Christ. This is what Robert M. Miller is suggesting in the following passage:

> Now, if the churches were ordinary institutions they could be excused for bowing to society's pressure . . .
>
> But—and this is the point—Christian churches are not merely groups of individuals banded together for fraternal or cooperative purposes. They are not judged by frail human standards but by the uncompromising ideals of the Christian creed. However noble the aims of other institutions, only the churches claim a divine mandate to glorify Almighty God. Other groups may falter and equivocate, but the churches cannot excuse the gulf between their professions of faith and their practices of paganism.[2]

One of the disturbing things about the Little Rock situation was that the clergy who elevated the unity of their local church into an absolute seem not to have raised the previous questions. They did not ask with Roy Eckhardt whether religion in America had become a folk religion.[3] They did not weigh the evidence which Will Herberg advances to show that the real faith of American churches is in the American Way of Life.[4] They did not raise the question as to whether the unity of the church could be purchased at too high a price. They did not ask whether they had a responsibility to raise in their own persons a witness to the truth in the very

areas where their churches could not or would not. There is no evidence to suggest that they would have appreciated Hendrik Kraemer's response to a query about a suspected revival of faith in Europe: "Why, perhaps there is. Church attendance seems to be decreasing."

But if a distorted view of the nature of the Church is one of the theological problems revealed by Little Rock, another one—and one very closely related to the first—is a distorted view of the nature of *agape*. " 'Actually, we've been taught that controversy is un-Christian,' pointed out one pastor."[5]

The avoidance of controversy is an all but universal phenomenon among ministers. It runs like a refrain through Pope's *Millhands and Preachers:*

> None of the religious associations or organizations in Gaston County adopted any resolutions or engaged in any institutional action with regard to the strike (p. 274); The failure of the ministers to condemn mob terrorism and police brutality . . . (p. 283); No open criticism of the methods by which they were expelled was forthcoming in Gaston County (p. 293); So far as memories are reliable, no minister in Gaston County commented publicly on the death of Mrs. Wiggins or on the failure to secure convictions of the parties responsible (p. 294); No protests came from the churches or ministers in Gaston County, however, and no action to change the situation. No records or memories survive of ministerial comments of any type (p. 301).

The Gastonia situation which Pope reports and the Little Rock situation Campbell and Pettigrew analyze were crisis situations. Therefore it is all the more interesting to note the same conclusion emerging from a study of a non-crisis situation. In *Small Town and Mass Society,* the authors note:

> The minister is in the peculiar position of having to play down those views which are inappropriate to the public values of the community. To a large extent he is unable to express what he personally believes, except for accepted, uncontroversial dogma . . . To different degrees for different ministers, the congregations and community socialize the minister to local values.[6]

Vidich and Bensman stress the tremendous social pressures which conspire to reduce the minister to silence. In the small town they are discussing, they find that the town leaders themselves—churchmen all—limit the role of the minister and of the church because they recognize that religion is potentially all-embracing[7] On the more limited scale of intra-church policy, Campbell and Pettigrew note the same thing. Here a church with a stable membership tends to develop its lay leaders who are a challenge to the leadership of the minister, whom they expect to outlast even as they predated his arrival. With their "our church" complex, they seek to circumscribe the minister's freedom to be controversial.

However, acknowledging the great pressures both within society and within the church making for ministerial silence, it is clear that, by and large, the ministers bear their chains with equanimity approaching acquiescence. The conspiracy of silence could not succeed without at least tacit help from the minister himself. And this help takes the form of affirming that controversy is somehow not nice. It is unChristian, unkind, and contrary to Christian love.

The marks of this attitude are on the whole of the life of the Church. In the local congregation Rotarian familiarity is the order of the day. Everyone is expected to be agreeable at all times—nice, friendly, affable. Nothing must mar the nice spirit that reigns. No disturbance that might threaten the perfect harmony

f the group must be permitted to gain foothold. Disruptive disagreements ust be stifled, controversial subjects wept under the rug. The peace that asses over all misunderstanding with mooth phrases and tranquillizing slo-ans rules unchallenged.

What is true of the local church is lso true of the denomination. The man ho raises questions, the man who chal-enges and objects, the man who presses contrary view in the councils of the enomination, if he does so with any requency, is labeled a trouble maker. He eed expect no advancement at the hands f his ecclesiastical superiors.

If Christian love is to be equated with kindness that avoids all controversy, n affability that skirts all unpleasant-ess, a friendly spirit that never jars, hen God is not love. The Christian od is neither nice nor genial. He is a onsuming fire—and this is precisely his ove. Kierkegaard was surely right when e wrote that he who would say that od is love must add as the subordinate lause "therefore He is your mortal en-my"—the enemy of thngs-as-they-are whether in me, in the Church, or in the vorld) for the sake of things-as-they-nay-be, in all their perfection and good-ess.

THE NOTION THAT CHRISTIAN love means that Christians must never be disturbers of the peace, must never of-end, or give utterance to any word that would be divisive or upsetting, is surely one of the strangest and most ironical perversions of New Testament truth. Our Lord was the greatest Lover of all—and the most controversial of all. True, he could preach on "Behold the lilies of the field, how they grow." But, as Halford Luccock reminds us, he could also preach on "Behold the thieves of the temple, how they steal." He was in perpetual hot water, and it was all of his own making. He just couldn't stay off controversial issues. In his very first recorded sermon, as given in Luke 4, he made his listeners (good church people, all) so angry that they tried to mob him. From then on, his ministry was a perpetual argument between him and the leaders of church and community—over the sabbath, the Law, the will of God, the interpretation of the Old Testament, the discharge of leadership responsibilities, and so forth. They didn't like it—who does? And since they could not silence him, they crucified him.

The record of the early Church follows the same basic pattern. At first the disciples stayed behind their own four walls "for fear of the Jews." But when they became indwelt by the Holy Spirit they became highly controversial. Peter celebrated Pentecost by accusing his hearers of being murderers—not the accepted way of winning friends and influencing people. The remainder of the Book of Acts is largely a running commentary on the controversy of the Church with society—and even occasionally with itself!

Controversy can be damning. Entered into out of hostility, for the wrong reasons and with the wrong motives, it is spirit of antichrist. But when entered into with the right motives, in the right spirit, at the right time—for the sake of truth, righteousness, and Christ—it invites the formulation of a new beatitude: "Blessed are the controversialists, for they shall be called the brethren of Christ." The proper place for the listing of this new beatitude would be just before the blessing pronounced on those who are reviled and persecuted.

Kierkegaard once wrote, "In the New Testament, Christianity is the profoundest wound that can be inflicted upon a man, calculated on the most dreadful scale to collide with everything."[8] And, first of all, it collides with the minister's own life and comfort. It we return to the Little Rock study—not because it is Little Rock, I repeat, but because Little Rock is Main St. and each of us is the

socially silent minister of the corner church—it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that behind the distortion of the Biblical view of the Church and of *agape*, lies a spiritual unpreparedness in the life of the minister. One must not generalize, of course. But if the silent ministers of Little Rick are at all typical, we are on sure ground in discerning a spiritual lack at the core of their dilemma. They were unprepared to look to Christ and him alone for their direction. They were unprepared to walk the way of the Cross. They were unprepared for the enmity of the world. They were unprepared for the loneliness of Christian leadership. They were unprepared for failure as the world judges it. They were unprepared for suffering.

The basis for this judgment is found in the attitudes which informed their decisions at the time of the crisis. In general, they reacted with the wisdom of this world rather than with the wisdom of the God who said of old, "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways." This criticism —which could be leveled at most of us who are ministers—has been implicit in much that has been said earlier. But let me focus it with a quotation from Campbell and Pettigrew:

> [The minister] also believes that communication with the sinner must be preserved at all costs—"You can't teach those you can't reach." It is important to maintain relations that allow the possibility of effecting gradual change in attitude and behavior over a longer time period. Especially, then, in a crisis period, when feelings run high, the time is not ripe for decisive action that risks alienation of those one wishes to change. Take Pastor X, whose actions, though decisive, damaged the church fellowship and threatened his pastorate—"Look at him; he can't do any good now." (p. 93).

THREE ATTITUDES ARE apparent here each one common to our general society there is the teacher's attitude: only the long processes of education can change people. The possibility that God can use other methods is not raised. There is the lawyer's attitude: my responsibility is only to my "client." The possibility of a larger responsibility—to the wider community, to the Church universal, to the Gospel and its truth—is not raised. There is finally the politician's attitude: I am the indispensable man without whom no good can emerge in this situation; if anything should happen to me all is lost. The possibility is not raised that the minister may have to be sacrificed for God's truth to strike home. The possibility is not entertained that the minister may have to be broken that others may be able to heal. The possibility is not faced that the minister may have to be crucified that God's glory may break forth in resurrection power.

What is *not* in evidence is the prophet's attitude. This commodity is in perpetually short supply in American Christianity. A thoroughly tamed and domesticated clergy finds the heights of cultural transcendence too much for it to climb. The clergy is by no means wholly to blame for this situation. Ministers are fashioned in churches which are fiercely determined to discourage a prophetic ministry. They are trained in seminaries which equip them to administer the program and meet the expectations of the already-existing institutions. (A course or two in Social Ethics is not enough to alter this general picture.) They find themselves on graduation in churches that know that their minister will not stay a lifetime and that therefore develop mores and habits relatively independent of the wishes of the minister, who is a prisoner of the democratic processes of the congregation.

Yet we ministers ourselves are blameworthy. We struggle so infrequently and feebly against the chains that bind us

y referring to the majority vote—as ough a vote were the ultimate arbiter a minister's conduct—we justify so sily our acquiescence in a betrayal of hrist by our congregations! We barter way their integrity at so cheap a price! The fact of the matter seems to be that e are called to be Christ-directed, and e end all too frequently, when the pres- ures of crisis threaten us, in being other- irected. And an other-directed Chris- anity has lost the capacity for tran- endence without which the lordship of hrist cannot be expressed. Will Her- erg says it well:

> . . . What can the other-directed man or woman of our society make of the prophets and the prophetic faith of the Bible? The very notion of being "singled out," of standing "over against the world," is deeply repugnant to one for whom well being means conformity and adjustment. Religion is valued as conferring a sense of sociability and belonging, a sense of being really and truly *of* the world and society; how can the other-directed man then help but feel acutely uncomfortable with a kind of religion—for that is what Biblical faith is—which is a declaration of permanent resistance to the heteronomous claims of society, community, culture, and cult? The other-directed man protects himself against this profoundly disturbing aspect of Biblical faith by refusing to understand it; indeed, insofar as he is other-directed, he really cannot understand it. The religion he avows is still formally the Jewish or Christian faith rooted in the prophetic tradition; it is, however, so transformed as it passes through the prism of the other-directed mind that it emerges as something quite different, in many ways, its opposite. . . .
>
> . . . The word of faith could be proclaimed and made to thrive in a hostile world, but how can it be communicated in a culture that is all for it but simply will not, cannot, understand it?[10]

When Whittaker Chambers renounced Communism (significantly, he called it leaving the winning side for the losing side) and returned to religious faith, he recorded his immediate impressions in these words:

> There was solemnity of another kind in the great spaces of the unfinished church [The Cathedral of St. John the Divine] in which huddled the little group with which I worshipped —old people mostly who seemed in that vast nave less like the bearers of those great tidings that had once stirred and transformed men's souls than like the survivors of a spiritual catastrophe and an age that could not long survive them.[10]

Compare this statement with what a Little Rock minister said at the height of the controversy:

> One of the most disappointing and frightening aspects of this task has been the realization by Little Rock clergymen of the position the Church actually holds in the eyes of so many in the world. . . . [The] staggering fact [is] that the Church is largely without influence in the day of society's trouble. . . . Thus the ministers of Little Rock have been made to see that for a great many people, religion receives that tip-of-the-hat respect as for an aged gentleman who has nothing to say or to give to the present.[11]

The impotence of the Church stems from the irrelevance of the Church. The irrelevance of the Church stems from its timidity, its refusal of controversy with the world, its renunciation of the role of social critic. The Church cannot be healed at this point unless its leaders are healed at this point. The training and experience of the minister must include training and experience in the role of social critic as well as in the role of

pastor, teacher, preacher, and administrator. Unless the present imbalance at this point is corrected, there will be many Little Rocks, in many places of the world, in many different areas of social concern and tension.

[1] Ernest Q. Campbell and Thomas F. Pettigrew, *Christians in Racial Crisis* (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1959), pp. 119 f, used by permission.

[2] Robert M. Miller, *American Protestantism and Social Issues,* 1919-1939 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958), p. 297, used by permission.

[3] A. Roy Eckhardt, *The Surge of Piety in America* (New York: Association Press, 1959), used by permission.

[4] Will Herberg, *Protestant-Catholic-Je* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co 1955). Note especially chap. v.

[5] Campbell and Pettigrew, *op. cit.,* p. 13 used by permission.

[6] Vidich and Bensman, *Small Town i Mass Society* (Princeton, N. J., Princeto Press, 1958) pp. 235-6, used by permission.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 272.

[8] S. Kierkegaard, *Attack on Christendo* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Pres 1944), p. 258.

[9] Will Herberg, "Faith and Characte Structure," *Christianity and Crisis,* Jan. 2 1954, p. 188ff, used by permission.

[10] Whittaker Chambers, *Witness* (Ne York: Random House, 1952), p. 483, used b permission.

[11] Campbell and Pettigrew, *op. cit.,* pp 129 f.

IS PRAYER TOO CHEAP THESE DAYS?

by Franklin D. Elmer, Jr.*

The telephone voice says, "Reverend, I represent the Society for the Elimination of the Hiccup. We are having our Annual Banquet in the Grand Ballroom of the Majestic Hotel next month. We should like you to be our guest for that occasion, and . . . er . . . ahem . . . Reverend, would you be so good as to say the Invocation for us before the dinner?"

So "The Reverend," knowing some of his friends belong to the organization, goes to the "big affair." When the diners have at last found their places at the tables, there is a furious banging on a plate with a spoon by the chairman to quiet down the symphony of saying this and that to each other which is making quite a din, and the chairman bids them rise to sing "The Star Spangled Banner," and then remain standing, please, while the Reverend . . .

Hardly has "The Reverend" said Amen when the din resumes—an overwhelming obligato to the scraping chairs and the loud guffaws.

As "The Reverend" wipes the grapefruit out of the corner of his eye several minutes later, he meditates upon this strange phenomenon, so common today in American life, this formalized gesture toward the Almighty, this smug little custo which carries with it so much self-assu ance that "we are pretty good people, yo know, basically very religious, of course!

By the time the slightly dried-out sli of turkey sits before him, "The Reverend is getting philosophical. "If I speak 1 15,000 words a day, and precede a few o them in public with the flattering addres "Great and Almighty God," perhaps I am becoming a party to the national illusio that God hears only what we want Hi to hear and that we can get his attentio immediately just by calling out his name.'

By the time he discards all except on bite of the dried cookie served with th dried ice-cream "The Reverend" is feelin not so reverend. Something tells him he i being made a priest of society, a chor boy of self-righteousness, a simple symbo of a social superstition. And suddenl there comes to him a new flash of ligh illuminating one of the earliest teaching of Jesus: "When you pray, don't be lik the play actors . . . When you pray, go in to your own room, shut your door, and pray to your Father privately."

* Pastor, First Baptist Church (ABC, CC) Flint, Mich.

A SERVICE OF WORSHIP IN CHRISTIAN MUSIC

Prepared by ROBERT MERRILL BARTLETT*
AND DONALD A. GILLIES*

Organ Prelude: "Liturgical Preludes" ..... Oldroyd

Hymn: "Lift Up Your Heads Ye Mighty Gates" ..... Ancient Plainsong

Call to Worship (Congregation standing)

MINISTER: O come, let us sing to the Lord.
People: Let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation!
MINISTER: Let us come into his presence with thanksgiving.
People: Let us make a joyful noise to him with songs of praise!
MINISTER: For the Lord is a great God.
People: And a great King above all gods.

Prayer of Confession (Minister and Congregation)

O thou Eternal Spirit, who hast set our troublous years in the heart of thy eternity, lift us above the strife and evil of the passing time, that under the shadow of thy wings we may take courage and be glad. Help us to conquer hopeless brooding and faithless reflection, and the impatience of irritable weakness, in a wholehearted surrender to thy will. Save us from fever and restlessness, from haste and confusion, from noise and perpetual movement. Draw us into those recesses of the Spirit where Jesus was one with thee. We praise thee that now, at this hour, we can be still and know that thou art God. Amen.

The Lord's Prayer

The Gloria Patri

An Interpretation: *The Plainsong*

The term plainsong is the broad term describing the musical form employed in Christian worship for many centuries prior to the Renaissance era, before the development of modern musical techniques. The familiar Gregorian chant was the particular plainsong liturgy used in the Western or Roman branch of Christendom, and is therefore most familiar to us. Over the centuries in both East and West, the plainsong was developed to a high degree of refinement, though never losing its basic simplicity, so that even today it is regarded by many as the nearest to perfection that we can come in musical language.

There are two distinctive characteristics which identify, in an unmistakable way, the plainsong style. The first is its melodic purity. There is no harmonic support

* Ministers, First Church, Shrewsbury, Mass.

for the melody or tune of the chant. Rather, it must stand alone, and comme itself to the hearer by the sheer beauty and logic of the melodic line. The seco characteristic is the rhythmic freedom of the chant. The melody is free from t limitations of "time signature" and "bar line," now so much a part of musi form, and is thus able to flow naturally with the sense and metre of the words.

The words of the hymn with which we opened our service, beginning "Lift up Yo Heads Ye Mighty Gates," were written for the Advent season during the seventeen century, but the tune is unquestionably a plainsong melody. This particular Adve tune can be traced back a thousand years or more in the history of Christian wo ship. Even through the harmonized version which we have sung, the beauty a haunting simplicity of the plainsong shines through, reminding us of a debt we owe to the ages.

Anthem: "Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison, Kyrie Eleison" .....Palestri
Lord, have mercy upon us, Christ, have mercy upon us, Lord, have mercy upon

An Interpretation: *Renaissance Hymns*

The Renaissance awakened the imagination of Europe and stimulated new expe ments in all the arts; in painting, sculpture, architecture, music and literature. music the new efforts liberated creativity from the bondage of the church. N qualities were more clarity, balance and euphony. In the fourteenth century mu became more humanized. The importance of the secular element is illustrated the fact that a French love song, *l'homme armé,* was used by almost every lead church composer of the time.

Palestrina (1525-1594), whose name was Giovanni Pierluigi, was born in Pal trina, trained as a choir boy, studied music in Rome, and became an organist a choirmaster. As musical director of St. John Lateran and Santa Maria Maggiori Rome he arranged and composed for church services. When the Council of Tre considered ruling music out of the church, Palestrina wrote dignified services high quality music and convinced the church officials that there could be mus without vulgarity and profanity. He was made master of music at St. Peter's 1571 and six years later Gregory VIII entrusted the revision of the liturgical chan to this composer who removed many decorations and embellishments.

Palestrina lost his two sons, his wife and two brothers in the plague. He decid to enter the priesthood but broke away, married the widow of a fur merchant a established himself as a successful business man as well as a musician. Much his music is based on plainsong, with a choral-like simplicity, and the secular so of the French and the Dutch. The anthem, "Kyrie Eleison" is an example a likewise the hymn, "Alleluia! Thy grace impart."

Hymn: "Alleluia! Thy Grace Impart" .....Palestri

Scripture Reading: Selected from the Psalms, the hymns of Israel

Pastoral Prayer

Anthem: "Laud We Thy Name" .....J. S. Ba
(Movement from a Protestant Cantata)

Interpretation: *The Music of the Reformation*

When we come to the great era of the Protestant Reformation, we find again that music plays a significant role in the changing events of life. Martin Luther was keenly interested in music as well as theology. He is credited by many students of his life with the authorship of a number of hymns, among which are such familiar favorites as "Away in a Manger," and "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God." Whether or not he actually wrote the music for these is still a matter for debate, but certainly he did champion a new approach to church music and merits our gratitude whatever the scope of his creative talent.

A quotation from Luther will illuminate us still further with regard to his attitude: "After theology, it is to music I give the first place and highest honor." Hence, it is not surprising that the music of the Reformation period should reflect, quite closely, the vitality of this new understanding of the Christian faith. The strong rhythm and the stirring harmony of "A Mighty Fortress" are ample testimony to the truth of this claim. The development of hymns in the language of the people, following upon the translation of the Bible into the vernacular by Luther himself, is yet another evidence of the revolutionary implications of the Reformation, especially for the ordinary man.

But in the musical world, it was Johann Sebastian Bach who most eloquently expressed in sound the spirit of the new found pietism. For, beyond its technical perfection, which in itself was unparalleled, the music of Bach caught the spirit of that direct access to God which was the abiding contribution of the Reformation. From the "Sacred Church Songs 1623," first published at Cologne, we will sing this stirring Reformation tune, the more recent text of which invites the faithful to praise their God, who is over all.

ymn: "Ye Watchers and Ye Holy Ones" .....Cologne, 1623

n Interpretation: *Use of the Psalter by early Protestants.*

With the Reformation Protestants turned to the Psalms which had been the inspiration of the Hebrews for centuries. They were translated into the vernacular, into English, French and Dutch, frequently in rhymed versions, and provided with music for the congregation. The Reformed church sought the texts for their songs in the Psalms. They felt that the Lutheran chorales were not drawn from the Bible. The French Psalter appeared in 1552 with the simple music of the Geneva Psalter. Calvin opposed the setting of Psalter melodies in parts but it was inevitable that they should be treated in this way.

The French Psalter was adopted in the Netherlands in 1566. During the middle of the sixteenth century many English Protestants fled to Geneva where they came under the influence of this music. The result was the Anglo-Geneva Psalter which English and Scots published. Another group of refugees from England came in contact with the French in Amsterdam. Here Henry Ainsworth in 1612 brought out a Psalter for the Congregationalists. It traveled to America with the Pilgrims along with the Geneva Bible. The *Bay Psalm Book* appeared in Massachusetts in 1640 but it did not displace Ainsworth for many years, although it is significant as the first book to be published on the American continent.

Congregational committee appointed in 1636 prepared the *Bay Psalm Book*. It was published in 1640 by President Dunster of Harvard on a press sent over from Holland as a present from friends there. This book was used in Scotland and printed in special editions with the Bible.

This music is formal and monotonous. The practice of lining out the Psalm disturbed the sense of the text and destroyed musical continuity. Each line was read by the minister or some layman and then sung.

An example is "We Love the Venerable House" from the Scottish Psalter of 161

Hymn: "We Love the Venerable House" .....Scottish Psalter, 161

Anthem: "Holy, Holy, Holy" .....Gouno

19th century anthem

An Interpretation: 19*th century Music*

The anthem which we have just heard reflects, quite well, the character of church music in the nineteenth century. In the field of secular music, the Romantic era brought to light new and lush harmonies, and an expressive power never before experienced. But, as fate would have it, the Church did not fare so well. The Victorian Age endowed the Church with much music that was inferior, unimaginative, and totally unworthy of the great heritage to which it was heir. From a musical point of view, the tunes were cheap, they often reflected the popular dance music of the day, and utilized monotonous repetitions and chromaticisms. In keeping with the low musical standard, the words were often highly subjective and almost morbidly sentimental. There was in them what someone has decribed as an "irritatingly priggish assumption of superiority."

Yet, largely because of their sentimental bent, these hymns have continued to plague the Christian Church and its leaders, even though their inferior quality is almost universally recognized. The erroneous idea that they are easier to sing than either ancient or modern hymns persists, and resentment of any attempt to abandon them continues to flourish. One is tempted to cry, with the Psalmist, "How long, O Lord?" The tragedy is that we have not really begun to explore the riches available to us in past and present outside this unfortunate period.

There are, of course, exceptions to any rule. And there are some fine hymns which deserve a place in the ongoing life of the church. Among the better composers of Victorian hymns was the Rev. John Dykes, who was precentor of Durham Cathedral in England for many years. His ability to supply tunes which caught the spirit of the text won him much acclaim, and, to this day, there are few Churches which do not enjoy a generous sampling of hymns by Dykes each year. The hymn which we are about to sing, "Bring, O Morn, Thy Music," is an example of the best of these.

Hymn: "Bring, O Morn, Thy Music" .....John D. Dykes, 186

The Offering

Offertory Anthem: "Gloria" .....Shaw

The Doxology (The Congregation rising)

ayer of Dedication (Congregation standing) Our Father, make us instruments of thy peace. Where there is hatred, let us sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is discord, union; where there is doubt, faith; where there is falsehood, truth; where there is fear, courage; where there is sickness, health; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; where there is sadness, joy; so may we become builders of Thy Kingdom in the world about us. Amen.

Interpretation: *The Modern Hymn*

Victorian hymns were pallid and sentimental. The gospel hymns that followed proved a questionable addition. Music was poor and the ideas were unworthy of Christianity. As literature and music they plumbed the depths of commonness. The modern age seeks hymns that express the application of religion to human life. Martin Shaw has done this in the anthem "Gloria." Ralph Vaughan Williams is one of our significant contemporaries. He was born in Gloucestershire, England, in 1872, the son of a clergyman. He studied at Cambridge, became an organist and conductor of the London Bach Choir. As a teacher in the Royal College of Music he utilized the riches of folk lore in composing orchestral works, hymns and choral numbers. He edited the *English Hymnal,* 1906, and helped prepare *Songs of Praise,* 1935. One of his finest hymns is "For All the Saints."

Our hymnal is a lyrical record of the spiritual seeking of thousands of fellow Christians. We may not be able to play their hymns or sing them well, but we can all appreciate their message and share their uplift. Let us treat each hymn reverently. Take note of the composer, the writer of the text, the date, the nationality, the ideas expressed. Consider the words carefully and reverently and try to grasp thir spiritual message. As Mr. Williams reminds us in our closing hymn we are compassed about by this mighty company of poets and singers who can help us realize the vision of God.

mn: "For All the Saints" .....Vaughan Williams, 1906

ıe Benediction (Congregation seated)

rgan Postlude

THE QUARTERLY FORUM

THE DILEMMA OF OUR LIBERAL EVANGELISM

by Rev. Kenneth A. Coates*

. . . we are not clear as to why evangelism is urgent.

Congregational churches in Oregon numbered 48 in 1948. In 1960 they numbered 49.[1] In the same state, in those years, Conservative Baptist Churches grew from less than fifty to 150—more than a tripling.[2] While realizing that numbers are not the ultimate measurement of Christian faithfulness, are we not justified in asking why the difference? Why are we in Oregon—and many other places too—barely holding our own, while the religious conservatives move ahead with great strides? Henry P. Van Dusen pointed out a few years ago in a *Life Magazine* article that the groups in what he calls the "third force" in Christendom are "spreading with remarkable rapidity. Their churches are to be found literally in every corner of the world—in ones and twos in nearly every rural American community, in dozens and scores on the back streets of any American city, by the thousands and tens of thousands across Asia and Africa and Latin America."[3]

One can give many reasons for the disparity in growth between our churches and the conservative and fundamentalist churches, but it seems to me that one major reason is urgency in evangelism. The conservative in religion is desperately urgent about the task of reaching the "lost." He believes that those who do not accept Jesus Christ (and usually immersion baptism) are going to hell, a quite fiery and awful hell, and he is about to save people from such a fate. Whatever we think of his theology, he certainly h dynamic for his evangelism, and this reflected in the great growth of his r ligious movement.

On the other hand, the liberal Chri tian, minister or lay person, so often lac urgency in the matter of evangelism. Paul Musselman points out, "On the ave age, the adult Episcopalian requires on third of a century to win another adu to the Church."[4] I'm sure the figur would be about the same for our CC E and R people. This is not, I believ due to laziness or lack of sincere love f God, but due rather to a dilemma in o thinking about evangelism. I'm not su of the answer to this dilemma, but I pr sent it here with a possible solution stimulate thinking and discussion amo our ministers.

Where are we liberal Protestants get our urgency in evangelism? W can't get it where the conservative doe in a literal hell-fire that will consum those who do not confess Christ Lord and Savior. Few if any of us cept the literal Biblical picture of hel particularly as given in Revelation, a most of us are dead-set against tryi to frighten people into Christian faith I have had parents from Roman Catho lic and fundamentalist Protestant back grounds tell me that they most em phatically do not want their childre taught the religion of fear to whic they were subjected as youngsters.

And even though we may believe i

* Pastor, Parkrose Community Congregational Church, Portland, Ore.

most of us are rather reticent
t telling people that unless they
Christ they will be lost forever.
rominent Presbyterian minister in
community said recently that he
sure there would be many Jews in
en, and I suspect that most Con-
ationalists would agree with him.
young student said recently in a
r to the *United Church Herald*,
es it not cater to our complacency
hink that being in the Church re-
es us from the company of the
"[5]

me of us recapture urgency by
splanting hell from the hereafter
he here. "This world will blow it-
to hell (or to pieces) unless we
enough souls to Christian disciple-
. For the sake of our children and
dchildren we must make disciples."
s is a more common viewpoint among
nd yet I seriously question whether it
stified. I am quite hesitant about as-
ng people that building the Christian
owship will guarantee a safer world
our children or grandchildren—I just
't know. In the Book of II Kings is the
y of a great religious revival under
l King Josiah, and yet this revival did
save the nation from destruction. The
y comment that the pious editor could
e was that "the Lord did not turn
n the fierceness of his great wrath . . .
use of all the provocations with which
nasseh had provoked him." (II Kings
26.) In other words, things had gone
far in Judah that even a reformation
a good king could not prevent destruc-
n. Isn't it possible that this is our situa-
n today? I can't believe that God's pur-
es are completely bound up in the sur-
al of western democracy, much as I
ue that democracy, and I am hesitant
use its survival as the rationale for
ristian evangelism. And where the de-
ction of the earth is concerned I am
minded of Emerson's comment when
d the world was about to end. "We
n do without it," he said.

Is our urgency, then, calling people to do good? The trouble is that so many of them are already deeply involved in doing good. I find that often the most resistant people to our evangelism are those people who are running the Cub Scouts, Campfire Girls, PTA's and so on, who respect the church as another good community agency, but just don't have time for it.

Isn't this our liberal Protestant dilemma in evangelism—that we are not clear as to why evangelism is urgent? We can't use the conservative's fear of hell fire, we are hesitant about the eternal "lostness" of those outside the Christian fellowship, and we're not at all sure that Christianity will be able to save the world from atomic destruction. And why call people into the Church to do good when they are already doing good outside?

I believe that the answer to our dilemma in evangelism is to be found in the concept of John 10: 10: "I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly." Robert Spike reminds us that the heart of Pentecost, and the legacy of every church, "is the fact of God in Christ . . . transforming the meaning of all the experiences of common life." So much of life today is dreadfully hollow, full of tensions, hatreds, fears and anxieties—the vast amount of mental illness in our time is one evidence of this. And the message that we have to proclaim is that in Christ God has acted and is acting to save us from this kind of meaningless existence, to give us a true center and a true purpose for living. As our *Statement of Faith* says, "He seeks in holy love to save all people from aimlessness and sin." We do not arrogantly boast of our monopoly of God's love, but humbly invite others to share with us that love which we have as yet only dimly apprehended, and to grow with us in appreciation of, and response to, that saving love as it has come to us in Christ.

We may not know the ultimate destiny of any human soul, and be glad to leave

that in God's hands. But there are people all about us whose lives are frustrated and small, narrower than God intended them to be. It may be that some persons find in Judaism or some other faith a fulfillment of life, but there are multitudes who are *not* finding this fulfillment *anywhere.* As the National Council of Churches declares, "Evangelism in our time must speak to the deep needs of men for radical healing—deeper than any conscious desire for comfort or success—and seek to call forth their acceptance of God's love."[7]

Isn't there an urgency involved here? Or are we content that men, like the Rich Fool, should vainly seek meaning in an endless accumulation of things? Are we satisfied to have children live in a world that may blow itself to bits, with no divine resources to hold them fast and to make them useful for God? Do we want people to face the future with black hopelessness, or with the unshakable confidence that God can yet use a humble, believing people for his great purposes for the world?

Without arrogantly condemning any one, then, and leaving the ultimate judgment to God, let us, as we grow in our understanding and appreciation of God's love in Christ, seek with urgency to share it with others.

---

[1] Congregational - Christian Year Book figures.

[2] *The Christian Review,* Portland, Oregon, April 24, 1961, pp. 4

[3] *Life Magazine,* June 9, 1958, pp. 122-124

[4] G. Paul Musselman, *The Church on the Urban Frontier,* pp. 54

[5] Letter by William A. Zeckhausen, *United Church Herald,* April 20, 1961, pp. 33

[6] Robert Spike, leaflet, *The Need for Evangelism*

[7] National Council of Churches pamphlet, *The Good News of God,* pp. 7

ARE WE STILL PROTESTANTS?

by JOHN JOSEPH STOUDT*

Must the institutional church stand between man and God or can man approach his God directly?

THE PROPOSALS LATELY made by church leaders for the creation of a "Reformed and Catholic" church which, they suggest, should be fashioned by organic union of Protestant groups, put into sharp focus an old question: are we still Protestant?

The difference between the Roman and Protestant forms of Christianity lies in the question whether the organization or the experience comes first. Romans assert that the Church—with capital "C"—mediates the experience while Protestants believe that given the experience the church follows. Romans assert that their church, directly deriving from the keys which the Lord gave to Peter, mediates grace through its sacramental and institutional life and that there can be no grace without this church. Protestants, both Lutheran and Calvinist, assert that we first experience grace, become conscious of having been justified by faith, and that from this experience, when shared, the fellowship of Christians comes. Thus Romans assert the essentiality of the organic institution while Protestants believe—or, at least, once believed—that the church is a voluntary society of those who are conscious of having experienced grace.

This distinction has deep implications in the fields of ethics, doctrine and the devotional life as well as in the practical implications of our religious faith.

Furthermore, under the pervasive impact of Ritschlian theology—and no one theologian seems to have had greater practical influence on modern American religious thought—our leaders seem to have become convinced that there can be no Christian faith apart from conscious con-

---

* Minister and Prof., Norristown, Pa.

tion with the organic institution. The passage in Ritschl is this: "We are e to know and understand God, sin, version, eternal life, in the Christian se, only so far as we consciously and entionally reckon ourselves members of community which Christ has founded." hile this passage, when taken in its con- t, is still Protestant in spirit, it has ne the less opened the floodgates for a v spirit to emerge, one which is very ch in evidence—that spirit which would uce Christian life to ecclesiastical poli- s. For when we "consciously and inten- nally" reckon ourselves part of the com- nity which Christ has founded, and en this is set up as the criterion for full membership in Christ's Body, n, sadly, we have reduced the Christian igion to churchmanship. Instead of a hering of believers we have created an ociation of ecumenical engineers.

So, in all seriousness we have to raise e old question again: are we still Prot- ant? We must pose to the leaders of e great American denominations, which ll think they are Protestant because they e not within the Roman fellowship, ether they are, *in spirit*, in the tradition the Reformers? Do they still think that e individual believer knows God's grace st, and then, with others like him, forms fellowship of those who have shared od's grace? Or, do they believe, in con- quence of Ritschlian theology, that ere can be no grace except that which mes through and from an institutional urch? Or, to put it simply, must the stitutional church stand between man d God or can man approach his God rectly? This is the issue which separates oman from Protestant.

Perhaps we stand on the threshold of a w reformation? Perhaps we have come see the emergence of the great mono- hic, centralized religious corporation r which policies are determined by a ard of Directors who then hand them wn to the local clergy to peddle to e man in the pew? Perhaps the great otest has died?

But there are still some Christians in this land for whom no ecclesiastical Board of Directors can speak. There are those lonely souls who know from first hand experience that their Redeemer lives. These Christians do not oppose the increase of the area where the love of God is known, nor do they oppose the ecumenical movement. But they do believe, and that with fervency, that God comes to man without benefit of clergy, that no top-heavy institution of busy ecclesiastics can stand between them and the gracious, saving love of God.

Are we still Protestant? Church leaders may have followed the logic of John Henry Newman without following him back to the bosom of Rome; but there are still those who do believe that the fellowship of believers is founded on the one rock—the Jesus Christ of their hearts.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

The following lines were carried in our weekly newsletter last summer:

You, The Church, and Vacation
If God is something optional,
then we can dispense with Him for the summer.

If worship is burdensome,
then the church should close down for a vacation,
allowing its members to recover and rest up.

BUT,
If God is a living reality,
then we should feel impelled to worship Him
at all times of the year.

If worship is an opportunity,
as well as a responsibility,
then we must avail ourselves of it
and offer this privilege unto others.

SO,
Don't take a vacation from God.
Do invite your company to attend church with you.

Yours for fewer closed churches,
Sincerely,
William R. Schorman
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Australia, anyone?! —Ed.

Dear Editor:

A friend of mine, recently in Perth, West Australia, visited a Congregational church, and there became acquainted with its Minister, Rev. Mr. John Bryant. The Rev. Mr. Bryant who has been to America on international gatherings previously, is most anxious to work out a parish to parish exchange for a year with an American, preferably a Californian.

My friend's description describes Mr. Bryant as having four children, ranging in age from 24 to 15 who are all well mannered and enthusiastic. Mrs. Bryant is well respected by the parishioners as was quite evidenced at two meetings and coffee at the church. Their home address is, 166 Labouchere, Como, West Australia, which is a very pleasant suburb of Perth.

Mr. Bryant would be very interested in communicating with Ministers interested in arranging an exchange.

Sincerely yours,
ALBERT G. COHEN
Oneonta Cong'l Church
So. Pasadena, Calif.

Dear Editor:

Just a note to say that I enjoyed very much your last page on the last issue of the MINISTER'S QUARTERLY. It indicates the major purpose both of the Oberlin Conference and of the preparations for New Delhi.

I hope very much that a large number of our ministers will take your advice, which was very good.

Thank you for this imaginative recommendation of the work of my commission.

Cordially yours,
PAUL S. MINEAR
New Haven, Conn.

Dear Editor:

I wish I could report that I had overcome my disenchantment with the QUARTERLY as it is currently conceived by its editor. The current (winter) issue precludes any such possibility.

Specifically, for some strange reason the editor, under the heading "in this issue," overlooked the most significant article he had. Despite the practical value of the material he cites, I venture to say that most readers were drawn immediately to the article written by my colleague, Jim McCutcheon, on Karl Barth. We are invited to a dialogue on educational and financial *methods* while the *theological* issue that fairly screams from your pages is ignored.

Any one who doubts this should compare the first paragraph of Mr. McCutcheon's article (note the pearls of wisdom on the common camp between modernism and Roman Catholicism) with the confused outpouring which appears over the signature of Mr. Arthur W. Greeley. Could the fact that Mr. Greeley so vividly confirms this Barthian charge have escaped our illustratious editorial board? I should prefer to think that it was this insight that led them to print the Greeley letter in the same issue with the McCutcheon article.

Mr. McCutcheon has rendered worthy service. Viewed against the background of confused liberalism it may be that his letter will serve its purpose by confronting us again with the colossus of modern theology: Karl Barth.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH B. AXENROTH
Worcester, Mass.

What a grouch! Ed.

More Messages to Greeley

Dear Editor:

I read with interest the letter from Arthur W. Greeley in the Spring 1961 issue of the QUARTERLY. It is evident that the gentleman has, at least theologically, grave epistemological limitations. His concept of worship and psychology is as bankrupt as his Christology. He states that Martin Luther was only once removed from Roman Catholicism. He is right; but he fails to recognize that his own thinking is but once removed from dialectical materialism.

His concept of worship is man-centered rather than God-centered, thus eliminating the need for any object of worship. If worship is but the emotional response to sensually perceived psychological stimuli, then the object is eliminated and worship has no further justification for existence.

Super-liberalism has labored under the illusion that the deep theological perception of Augustine and the Church Fathers, the intellectual agility and sturdy peasant fist of Luther, the flaming pen of Calvin, and the heroic zeal of Zwingli have disappeared on the Western horizon. Being thus deluded, it long ago made a casket in which to bury orthodoxy. But the tranquilizers from its philosophical hypodermics have not yet subdued the victim. The gorgeous little sarcophagus in which it sought neatly, sweetly, and completely to inter the Holy Church of Jesus Christ awaits, not the intended victim, but the builder of the casket. The Church still cries, "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?"

Respectfully yours,
ELMO D. BECK
Salisbury, N. C.

ear Editor:
Brother A. W. Greeley's letter can really art an argument. I fear he has been swept "American Religion" so popular today to the same heresy as the Romanist, Fundamentalist and Liberalist, that a man by his od works, good life, or good intentions can please God that He will save him.
In the Church of the apostles the pattern salvation proclaimed is not (1) man is a ner, (2) man loves and pleases God, *therefore* (3) God loves man, and (4) God saves an. They preached that (1) man is a sinr, (2) God loves man, *therefore* (3) God ves man, and (4) man loves and pleases od. In the former, there is no logical "psyological" reason for man to change from n to obedience. In the latter the reason is ain. The former has no support in Scripture life, while, in the latter, change in man is rought about by the regenerative power of od as he works for man's salvation through s Son, Church, and servants. In the former, ie initiative is with man, while in the tter it lies with God who loves the ungodly nner and saves him by his own mighty arm. fan, though unloving and unloveable, saw ie loveableness of God, in Christ, and beame loving and loveable.
As for psychology, it is a study of man. It an only reveal as much of God as is mirrored nperfectly in man. What findings fit man annot be assumed to fit God. Man is elfish, sinful, insecure, etc., because of his ack of true knowledge. Yet God knows erfectly and is truth, so in Him there is no onfusion to cause the former estates. So, ow can psychology be passed off as the highay to God?

Sincerely,
Albert W. Kovacs
Warren Twp., N. J.

The Pastor as Teacher

Dear Editor:
Having read Arthur Shaw's *The Pastor as Teacher*, in the Spring '61 Minister's Quarterly, I am tempted to launch a full scale point by point response but perhaps the lack of time is matched by the lack of necessity. It is enough to raise a question about Mr. Shaw's basic concept of Christian education: "to train the child to use the intellectual tools of his culture in a Christian context so that he may be adequately prepared to face the existential reality of life in terms of the Gospel." I find the key description of Christian education to be that of training the intellect. There is the assumption that, having acquired knowledge, it will become a part of life, that the mind is the controlling part of the human personality, of human behavior, and of a person's relationship to God.

Mr. Shaw is obviously entitled to his opinion about this, but I would suggest that he come to terms with the experience of mankind which indicates that, "knowing something in the intellect" offers no assurance that it will even moderately shape life. There is, for example, the testimony of the Bible which does not report that God's people use their intellect to find their way with God and man but their wills, their feelings, their whole personalities. Also, Jesus never asked his disciples to assent to ideas or creeds or anything like an intellectual statement but to a way of life in a new age. Also, Paul wrote, not of intellectual matters, but of a quality of life. The Bible talks about life in a community, about encounters between persons and between persons and God. Anything in the Bible that we can label an idea or a matter for the intellect is the statement or description of what happened in the lives of persons. I have always assumed that this was set down not for us to believe as content or as information but to use as a guide to discovering a life in church, family and world that gives expression to the Gospel and is our response to what God has done and is doing for us.

Clearly, part of Christian education is knowing the Biblical record and also the story of the Church, but Christian education is woefully incomplete if it stops with this intellectual discipline and fails to offer the person a place in a class, a group or a congregation where the Gospel lives.

Then, too, all I know about the way in which persons learn tells me that information and content—the stuff with which the intellect deals—is not enough. The truth described in the content comes alive in the experience of the child and it is part of the necessary business of education to make this possible.

Christian education is the introduction of persons to the life of a Christian community. A community that owns, reads and responds to the Bible; that knows its history and tradition; that worships God; that is made real in the meetings between persons in which the Holy Spirit speaks through the stuff of life.

Given this concept of Christian education it is not the minister who has the primary teaching role but the members of the community. The minister is pastor to all the congregation. This involves teaching, of course, but always teaching in a way that recognizes his place not as *the* teacher but as *a* teacher among a congregation of teachers.

Roger Shinn has made four points in connection with this matter and I would simply list them assuming that they speak for themselves:

1) Christian education is not teaching about Christianity, rather it is inviting

persons to share the common life of Christians.

2) Christian education carries out the modest task of inviting people to share in the life of a community and does not play God by making them Christians.
3) Christian education knows that the Christian faith is not primarily a set of beliefs but is the life of the people of God.
4) The Bible is used in Christian education not as content but as the account through which God addresses and reveals himself to man.

The minister's role is indeed that of a teacher of teachers and it is his primary pastoral duty so to teach that the adult members of a congregation can effectively introduce persons of all ages to the Christian faith in the life of the church.

Most sincerely,
RICHARD L. SNYDER
Westport, Conn.

Religious Materialism

Dear Editor:

No doubt Professor Gregory (*Religious Materialism,* Spring 1961) would be most critical of a prayer which asks, "Give us this day our daily bread."

I fear that we ministers have propagandized so much in the cause of stripping religion of its "crude, materialistic rewards" that we have led our congregations into a dualistic ontology.

It is time to restore the balance. Let us proclaim a Christ and a Faith relevant to the everyday lives of our people, and yet radically transcendent: "If then you have been raised with Christ, seek the things that are above." (Col. 3: 1)

Sincerely,
LOWELL D. STREIKER
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Editor:

The article on *Religious Materialism* by W. Ernest Gregory in the Spring issue of the QUARTERLY emphasizes a message which needs to be repeated over and over again in our modern society. However it was two parenthetical statements towards the end of the article which pulled me up short. I cannot believe that God brings illness and pain—or, as stated in the next paragraph, that God sees fit to bring upon us the afflictions of war.

In all cases of such tragedy and misfortune the wilfulness and ignorance of man enter too forcibly into the picture to describe them as the positive will of God. Admittedly they are the judgments of God, but isn't this something altogether different?

Sincerely,
C. NEILSON BURN
Orange, Conn.

Call Me "Doctor!"

Dear Editor:

Some time ago you wrote a short article for these pages which urged that academic titles be dropped by ministers and that the title "doctor" be reserved (if only for the sake of lessening confusion) for those in medical or academic professions. You made the perfectly valid point that the title bestowed by the Church at a minister's ordination, namely, "The Reverend," takes precedence over titles bestowed by academic institutions. You pointed out that there is a difference in office between a rabbi (doctor) and a Christian minister and implied that "Minister" or "Pastor" are more appropriate designations for the latter.

I wish to take exception to this general thesis. A man who has spent the long years and the blood, sweat and tears to say nothing of the thousands of dollars that go with earning a doctorate from a respectable university or seminary; or the man who has labored in the Lord's vineyard with such distinction that a college or university is moved to recognize him with a doctorate *honoris causa*—such men are entitled to the courtesy of having their achievement acknowledged by the use of the title "doctor." Now, of course, there are many people who deserve honorary degrees and never get them; and there are many whose academic achievements are as great as those of the Ph.D. (or greater) but who just never acquire that degree. And then, too, there are people who come by doctorates unworthily. But these facts do not lessen the courteous obligation appropriately to recognize those who have bona fide doctorates.

This writer protests the increasing unsurpation of the title "doctor" by physicians and college teachers as their exclusive property. The word "doctor" comes from the Latin *docere,* to teach—and carries the idea of teacher or learned man. The title has been long associated with the Church and was first conferred academically by the Christian universities of medieval Europe in the faculties of Law and Theology.

The ministry of the Christian Church has as much claim to be a learned profession as the rabbinate of Judaism—and the duty of the minister to teach the faithful is not one whit less than that of the rabbi. So then, the minister who has paid the price of scholarship or service so as to have the doctoral degree conferred on him is at least entitled to be hailed as "doctor" on all those occasions when he would otherwise be addressed as "mister."

PETER G. GOWING
Dumaguete, Philippines

r Editor:
ermit me to share with you one of God's
es given in the Baptism sacrament of
infant through our Lord Jesus Christ.
ently I was called to the home of dis-
ght parents whose 6 month old child
l suddenly of a virus infection. The
her said when I arrived: "Nothing you
say will help me. How could God permit
a thing to happen to my child?" Surely,
astor could thus detect a problem where
n in God's love had to be strengthened.
father sat silently. He was Roman
holic but was present with his wife and
sors when I baptized the child five
ths previous at a worship service. I said
hem, "God loves all children all over the
ld baptized or not, their souls belong to
n in life and in death. When you brought
r child for Baptism you were bearing witness, testifying to your fellow Christians, to the world, that you, in your own hearts know and believe that God loves infants, children, and thus you know He also loves your child and in His love will never permit the soul of a child to perish. Surely if you believed and knew it then, bore witness to it, all I would like to do is to remind you of that testimony which in God's sight still stands. The soul of your child has become an angel in heaven, and angels are needed to proclaim His glory." The bereaved mother and father responded with a smile, the mother asking: "Will you pray for us?" The Holy Comforter was with us all. Infant Baptism is a witness, a testimony of our faith in the Grace of God, the Love of Christ and the Comfort of the Holy Spirit.

JOHN F. STEVE
West Seneca, N. Y.

PAUL BIDS FAREWELL TO ONESIMUS

by KELLY JANES*

Beggars and robbers keep an expensive school.
You might have lost more than your bondage there.
Thanks to the God of mercy, might and prayer,
You are returned to reasonable rule,
Recognize it was you who were the fool,
Not your master with his Christian lore.

Don't let them misname you Useless any more,
Or, if they do, laugh down their ridicule.
You are of as much use in your way
As Philemon in his, now you know you are not free
But are his slave, he yours.

Since the day
My jailer found you, brought you in to me,
You have been reciting what God taught you when
You thought you were learning from rebellious men.

* Pastor, Congregational Church, Monterey, Mass.

Fathers and Brethren:

I have just returned home from watching the Memorial Day parade. While the matter of chief importance to me was the fact that my daughter plays the flute in the High School Band I have to confess that as an incorrigible sentimentalist such occasions uncork in me a whole jugfull of emotions, memories, even ideas for sermons.

With great restraint I shall try to confine myself to a brief comment on the following train of thought: The Memorial Day parade reminds me that this is the centennial year of the beginning of the War Between the States. Since I am up to my eyebrows in preparations for General Synod I am reminded that the end of our 20 year debate on the United Church of Christ is something like the end of the Civil War. And after coming home from the parade I have just re-read *Lincoln's Second Inaugural* which in many of its ringing phrases speaks to us.

To compare our Union with the Union defended by Lincoln will seem to some as presumptuous as calling it the United Church *of Christ*. Only God in his final judgment can evaluate historical movements, but, for better or worse, many have believed in the United Church enough to strive to bring it to pass, and some have staked their earthly reputations and careers upon it. We have desired it greatly—more than we feared controversy or schism or litigation—and now it is here, bought with a price.

The days ahead are for "binding up . . . wounds" and finishing "the work we are in."

If history is to prove the United Church of Christ worth its cost as it has proven the Union preserved 100 years ago worth its price it will be because of great exercise of patience and faithfulness on the part of all of us. We have to be careful in the words we use. I can't even mention the words, because if I did I would have to explain why some words make some people angry and others cause others to bridle, but they do. It is interesting that the points of view expressed by vocal CC "antis" over the years are exaggerations of fears that some CC "pros" have felt about the Union. And, conversely, the doubts lifted up this spring by E and R leaders with misgivings about proceeding as we have planned to proceed are large editions of smaller doubts in the minds of many E and R people who have voted to go ahead on schedule. These points of irritation are added to sensitivities already existing between CCs of various parties and different kinds of E's and R's. So, patience in explaining our deep concerns and patience in listening to the deep concerns of others will be needed in unlimited quantities in the days ahead—along with much grace to forgive seeming slights that are really only misunderstandings.

Here, the final paragraph of Lincoln's address comes crystal clear with its three marvelous admonitions:

1. *Malice toward none.* There is no Christian excuse for malice, and there is some abroad in our fellowship. Remember, malice is something that I can only attack in myself, and it is always a beach-head of the Enemy, no matter what the cause or provocation.

2. *Charity for all.* This includes CC's, E and R's, pros, antis, and malcontents of all parties and no party. Especially, it includes another stubbornly holding to an opinion or a procedure long cherished by him and not held at all by me.

3. *Firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right.* This is the principle that gets us off dead center and starts us moving. Without it the United Church of Christ would never have survived the storms through which she has come to this place. With it she can take the place she has won in the vanguard of the ecumenical movement—which many believe to be the New Reformation.

Fraternally yours,
Nathanael M. Guptill

Application for Enrollment of a Congregational Christian Minister also as a Minister of the United Church of Christ

(To be mailed to the body in which the minister holds his ministerial standing, provided that body has been elected to act as an association or conference of the United Church of Christ, **otherwise** to the Secretary of the United Church of Christ.)

To the Registrar of the ..... Association
(or Conference)

Being a Ministerial Member of the

.....

Congregational Christian Association or Conference

And being recorded in the 1960 Year Book of the Congregational Christian Churches as a Congregational Christian Minister, I hereby request to be enrolled also as a Minister of the United Church of Christ with like status.

Signed .....

Address .....

.....

Date .....

This space to be filled in by the Association Registrar after which this form is to be filed in the Association's permanent records.

On this ..... day of ..... 19..... the above-named Congregational Christian Minister was enrolled also as a Minister of the United Church of Christ, and a record and certificate of this enrollment was sent to the Minister, to the Conference Executive, and to the Secretary of the United Church of Christ.

Signed .....
Registrar

.....

Congregational Christian Association or Conference acting as an Association of the United Church of Christ